DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 231 CS 507 102

AUTHOR Gilson, Joan Tedrow
TITLE Values Education in College and Universities: An Overview of Collaborative Projects between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 20p.
PUB TYPE Reports - General (140)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Programs; Cooperation; Higher Education; *Organizational Communication; *Student Needs; Theories; Universities; *Values Education
IDENTIFIERS Seattle University WA; Syracuse University NY

ABSTRACT

This paper provides an overview of current student development programs that include values education and that represent collaborative work between student affairs and academic affairs divisions. It examines a variety of programs, including freshman seminars designed to promote retention, interdisciplinary courses and seminars at all levels, and total systems of design that have significantly transformed the culture of their institutions in the process of meeting the needs of students. The paper discusses collaborative theory, milieu management, and values development pedagogy as a theory base for these programs. It also provides a brief discussion of the advantages of such education to the schools, students, and communities involved. The paper identifies existing values education programs including: University 101 (University of North Carolina); Academic Intervedntion Program (Rider College); New Student Seminar (Duquesne University); Guided Studies Seminar (El Centro Community College); and the Sierra Project (University of California at Irvine). The paper explores two values education programs, at Seattle University and Syracuse University, which reflect the assumptions of collaborative theory, student development philosophy, and milieu management. Twenty-five references are attached. (MG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED332231

Values Education in Colleges and Universities: An Overview of Collaborative Projects between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs

Joan Tedrow Gilson

University of Missouri-Kansas City

Running head: Values

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS507102

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

JOAN TEDROW GILSON

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Values Education in Colleges and Universities: An Overview of Collaborative Projects between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs

ABSTRACT

Although current events indicate that college students should receive some sort of values education, few colleges try to fulfill this responsibility to any significant extent, leaving the task entirely to student affairs professionals. Student affairs divisions cannot do the job alone, however, and in several places across the country they are creating collaborative alliances with faculty in their institutions in order to implement student development and values education programs.

Collaborative theory, milieu management, and values development pedagogy provide the theory base for these programs.

This paper provides an overview of several of these programs and a brief discussion of the advantages to the schools, students, and communities involved (i.e. better retention, preparation to meet the challenge of assessment, and, ultimately the survival of the school).

Values Education in Colleges and Universities: An Overview of Collaborative Projects between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs

Few readers of recent newspapers can avoid drawing the conclusion that something is seriously amiss in the values education of many college and university students today. In recent months The Chronicle of Higher Education has featured articles reporting computer vandalism by students (Ex-student, 1990, p.A-2), large scale cheating schemes (94 students suspended, 1990, p. A-2), and surveys reporting that students perceive the prevailing culture as largely amoral and even immoral (Collinson, 1990, pp. A 33-A34). And, lest we entertain further doubts as to the pervasiveness of the problem, we find that authorities and researchers report evidence showing that college students are growing increasingly materialistic and narcissistic (Wilson, 1990).

Such antisocial and even dishonest behavior in the segment of our population supposedly educated enough to know better may seem surprising, but, unfortunately, the fact is that few American colleges and universities offer students any substantial, formal values education, that is, education designed specifically to clarify values, assist students with identity tasks, and promote the development of judgement and committment. Because university faculty have little respect for values education, perceiving it as

irrelevant to the acquisition and creation of knowledge, the task of values education, when it is included in college and university education at all, is often left to the underfunded and unsupported efforts of the student affairs division of the university (Shaffer, 1961, p. 183).

Working alone within the complex structure of the modern university, Student Affairs divisions receive little recognition and fewer resources from the rest of the institution for their student development programs. The historic and philosophic split between student affairs and faculty described by Sandeen (1985) and Kuh et al. (1987) exacerbates the current situation, resulting in a divided, unresponsive and often wasteful institutional organization that separates faculty and student affairs labors at the classroom door (Cowley, 1957). The fragmented efforts of both divisions are less than effective in the work of providing students with the best possible education, an education that includes both the knowledge base valued by faculty and the student development perspective that comprises a legitimate goal for higher education (Boyer, 1987). Much recent writing and research, however, examines ways to mend the rift between the two divisions, and the work of Bruffee (1984) and Crookston (1975, 1983), especially, offer advice and real guidance for those of us working within both the administrative and faculty setting of institutions to meet students' needs for acquisition of

Knowledge and moral development. These writers describe both learning and administrative processes in their respective theories of collaboration and milieu management, and these processes both contain the means of bridging the gap and even of building a community that encompasses the culture of both student affairs professionals and faculty members.

This genuine kind of collaborative effort offers a sound method for introducing and implementing values education in colleges and universities. The purpose of this paper is first to provide an overview of current student development programs that include values education and that represent collaborative work between student affairs and academic affairs divisions . We will examine a variety programs, including freshman seminars designed to promote retention, interdisciplinary courses and seminars at all levels, and total systems of design that, while created for the purposes of student development and values education, have at the same time significantly transformed the culture of their institutions in the process of meeting the needs of students. We will also briefly discuss the process, pedagogical theory bases and organization systems underlying the design and content of these latter programs.

EXISTING VALUES EDUCATION PROGRAMS

These programs represent rudimentary forms of collaborative effort for the purpose of values education. Generally initiated by student affairs divisions, the programs described here only make use of faculty at the delivery end of the process, relegating them strictly to instructional roles. Faculty are not involved in discussing, setting goals for and reevaluating the purposes and results of these programs.

University 101

Using a variety of instructional methods, including small group processes, the writing process, lecture and field trips, the justly famous University 101 program of the University of North Carolina, uses faculty and student personnel as instructors in the program whose major purposes are retention, academic success, and student development (Jeweler, 1989, pp 205-213).

Values education represents a significant component of the program, since this is the means both by which the sense of community necessary to retention and the sense of identity necessary to academic achievement are nurtured. Instructors are constantly recruited from all sectors of the university for this course, and are trained in a process that includes a five-day, intensive session. The success of this particular program appears to stem from the enthusiasm and renaissance qualifications of its founder, Jerome

Jewler, actor, advertising instructor and student personnel professional (Jewler, 1989).

Academic Intervention Program

Rider College has implemented a student development program featuring a values education component targeted to underachieving freshmen (Dunphy et al., 1987, p. 49). Although the title of the program implies an academic focus, the basic premise of the program's design is that freshman academic failure is the result of difficulties with self esteem and that values development is crucial to the development of identity. The designers of the program have identified a specific pattern of personality traits in academic underachievers that includes a weak, inconsistent values system. Students voluntarily participate in weekly small group meetings, learning to set goals and identify their values, among other activities. The groups are facilitated by both faculty and student affairs professionals.

New Student Seminar

Duquesne University's New Student Seminar offers a process-based course that includes a values education component. (Dunphy et al.,1987, p. 58). Instructors are drawn from both faculty administration and student services and are trained through a national conference on The

Freshman Year Experience through the University of South Carolina. At the end of the seminar, student grade point and retention improved, and surveys revealed that students felt a greater sense of community.

Guided Studies Seminar

El Centro Community College provides its students with a Guided Studies program, an intensive individualized program with a remedial function (Tollefson, 1972, p. 72). The major focus of the program, however, is on student development, improving the self concept and confidence of its participants. As a result of its success, this program was legitimitized as part of the institution and became the Division of Complementary education under the Dean of Student Affairs. The mission of the program, in addition to serving the students, is to increase awareness of faculty and staff of student development needs. The faculty participates in student affairs programs, instructs students through personal contact, and receives release from teaching duties in order to participate in the program.

The Sierra Project

The University of California at Irvine designed the Sierra Project as a psychological education program focused exclusively on values education, viewing the development of

of moral reasoning within the larger perspective of all learning and experience (Whitely, 1980, pp.40-44). The success of the Sierra project demonstrated that it is possible to implement a replicable curriculum for values development, thereby increasing the theory base for further study and for implementation of such programs by other colleges and institutions.

PROCESS, ORGANIZATION, AND THEORY

Process: Collaboration

In recent years, values education programs have assumed a broader base of operations in the university setting than that reflected in the projects described above. Designers of such programs not only recognize the importance of early and consistent faculty involvement to the success of these programs, but they also have grown to understand the crucial role of more extensive collaborative processes for student services and for faculty in the creation and implementation of student development and educational programs (Dalton, 1985). Kenneth Bruffee has described collaboration as a process of co-labor, an ongoing process of talking and working together in which all parties are able to confidently offer their expertise in service of the mutually agreed-upon goals of the partnership (1984, 635-652). In successful moral development programs, it appears that student services professionals have at last achieved the

necessary degree of self-esteem and self assertion to advocate and advance the cause of the student development point of view in on-going dialogues and working partnerships with faculty.

Theory: Values Pedagogy

That self esteem seems to be based, in large measure, on the strong base of theory and research now undergirding the pedagogy of values education. The work of Kohlberg (1981) and Perry (1968, 1970) offers educators paradigms of moral development based on the orientations of justice and committment , respectively. Gilligan (1982), working with the previously unresearched patterns of female moral development, has described a value system based on relationship and compassion. Chickering (1969) was the first to apply some of these findings directly to the development of college students, and Schlossberg's work (1984) speaks to the development of the adult, nontraditional college student.

Organization: Milieu Management

Besides collaborative processes and a strong theory base, the processes of milieu management also provide sources of success for these programs. As described by Crookston, milieu management is "the systematic coordination and integration of the total campus environment . . .

towards growth and development as a democratic whole" (1975, 1983, p.398). A natural and logical basis for collaborative undertakings, this management strategy requires consistent attention to relationships along with frequent consultation and cooperation among all members of the university (p.408).

The following two values education programs, the first at Syracuse University and the second located at Seattle University, clearly reflect the assumptions of collaborative theory, student development philosophy, and milieu management.

Seattle University

The collaborative program for student development and values education at Seattle University is chiefly noteworthy for its organizational emphasis on bridging the gap between faculty and student affairs (Stringler, Steckler, & Johnson, 1988, pp. 45-53). The premise of this program is that since student learning cannot be divided into intellectual and affective domains, the institutions of higher education and their administrative practices cannot be so divided either. Recognizing that they had to bridge a gap between cultures if they were to create a community between faculty and student services, the designers of this program emphasized the process of bridge building, using a strategy of promoting small group projects wherever appropriate. The resulting collaborative climate enabled the program to

survive and prosper, to the greater benefits of the students, the faculty and staff, and the institution.

Syracuse University

This account of the total collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs for the purpose of student development and moral education was reported by P.E. Eickman in NASPA (1988 pp.40-44). Several years in the making, the program is the result of the shared committment and contribution of both faculty and student service administrators to the process of design, implementation and accountability created especially for this effort (p.40).

The shared committment can be attributed to the collaborative climate at Syracuse, a climate initiated in the student affairs office and nurtured throughout the university. Four factors necessary to the success of the collaborative effort included: the committment of the Chief Student Affairs Officer to collaboration and student development, a similar committment and willingness to follow on the part of the Chief Academic Affairs officer, a structured planning process, and a cadre of middle managers who were open to collaborative efforts.

The planning process involved the adoption of ten office-wide goals, with priority granted to the creation and expansion of collaborative partnerships throughout the

university in every office. All major student affairs units wrote and submitted both goal statements and specific statements of implementation for goals, always focusing on the central task of collaboration. Offices were held accountable for their accomplishments through quarterly update sessions and written reports summarizing results. The resulting success of the projects, including course work for values education, engendered much enthusiasm on the part of both staff and faculty, an enthusiasm which resulted in the creation of more partnerships and more programs.

The process of establishing and extending relationships became part of the standard operating procedure for this institution, resulting in a successful program of moral education (among others) for students, and more importantly, a sense of community for all participants (pp.40-41).

In response to the new climate of collaboration, the office of academic affairs institutitonalized collaboration by creating an office in charge of that process, including a liaison, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, to work with student affairs. In that way, productive relationships between the two offices were no longer dependent solely on the individual initiative of the officers involved, but became part of the life of the institution (p.43).

CONCLUSION

By bridging the cultural chasm between student affairs and academic affairs, collaboratively-designed programs for the moral development of students have accomplished both practical and long term benefits.

Practical benefits include the increased retention and academic accomplishment of the students. Higher grade points will help institutions faced with both the prospect and the reality of state-mandated assessment of academic skills. Another practical benefit of this kind of project is that the schools are now better prepared to address another assessment charge, the task of state-mandated assessment of student attitudes and values, a very real possibility, considering the current trends in higher education (Ashcroft,1987, p.6).

Long term benefits of the collaborative efforts described here have been to enable universities to dismiss former confusions over mission, further empowering administrators and faculty to more clearly understand the need to define their missions more appropriately and to learn to see the mission of teaching, research and service in the context of values education (Fitzpatrick, 1988).

But probably the most significant long term result of collaboration involved in these programs is the community created within the university, not only in the programs and classes for students, but within and between the offices of administrators and faculty. Community, shared committment,

has been shown to be a factor in the development of the integrity of all involved: students, faculty, and administrators (Morrill, 1980; Wilson, 1990). In the long run, the city, state, and nation served by these universities and their graduates also benefit from the increased emphasis on integrity within these institutions, and the university and college that understand the importance of providing that emphasis to the communities they serve will go a long way towards insuring their own survival in times of fiscal austerity and in the face of the numerous adverse conditions that constantly threaten higher education in America.

Values education has a legitimate place in American universities, and collaboratively run programs for values education make for successful programs while contributing to the success of students and the effectiveness and survival of the institution. More college and university administrators should look to these programs and to collaborative working relationships as practical solutions to many institutional dilemmas. Clearly, it's the right thing to do.

References

Boyer, E. (1987). College: The undergraduate experience in America. New York: Harper and Row.

Bruffee, K. (1984). Collaborative learning and the conversation of mankind. College English, 46 (7), 635-652.

Chickering, A.W. (1969). Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Collinson, M. N.-K. (1990, January 17). Apparent rise in students' cheating has college officials worried. Chronicle of Higher Education pp. A33-A34.

Cowley, W.H. (1936, 1983). The nature of student personnel work. In G.L. Saddlemire & A.L. Rentz (Eds.), Student affairs: A profession's heritage (pp. 47-63). Alexandria, Va..: American College Personnel Association.

Crookston, B.B. (1975, 1983). Milieu management. In G. L. Saddlemier & A.L. Rentz (eds.), Student affairs: A profession's heritage (pp.396-409). Alexandria, Va.: American College Personnel Association.

Dalton, J.C. (Ed.) (1985). Promoting values development in college students. NASPA monograph series,4.

Dunphy, L., Miller, T.E., Woodruff, T. & Nelson, J.E. (1987). Exemplary retention strategies for the freshman year. In M.M. Stodt & W.M. Klepper (Eds.) New Directions for Higher Education, no. 60

(pp.39-60) San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Eickman, P.E. (1988). A systematic approach to fostering an academic and student affairs interface. NASPA, 26 (1), 40-44.

Ex-student at Cornell is convicted of paralyzing computers on network (1990, Jan. 31). Chronicle of Higher Education. p.A-2.

Fitzpatrick, M.M. (1988). Social responsibility in higher education.NASPA Journal, 25 (3), 191-194.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.

Jewler, A.A. (1989). Elements of an effective freshman seminar: The university 101 program. In M.L. Upcraft & J.N. Gardner, (Eds.), The freshman year experience (pp. 198-215) San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Justiz, M.J. & Rendon, L.I. (1989). Hispanic students. In M.L. Upcraft & J.N. Gardner (Eds.), The freshman year experience (pp. 261-276). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice. San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Kuh, G.D., Shedd, J.D., & Whitt, E.J. (1987). Student affairs and liberal education: Unrecognized and (unappreciated) common law partners. Journal

College Student Personnel, 28 (3), 252-259.

Morrill, R.L. (1980). Teaching values in college: facilitating development in ethical, moral, and value awareness in students. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

94 students suspended in grade-fixing scheme. (1990, January 31). Chronicle of Higher Education, p.A2.

Perry, W.G. (1968, 1970). Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Sandeen, A. (1985). The legacy of values education in college student personnel work. In J. Dalton (Ed.) Promoting values development in college students (pp.1-16). NASPA Monograph series 4.

Schlossberg, N.K. (1984). Counseling adults in transition Linking practice with theory. New York: Springer.

Shaffer, R.H. (1961, 1983). Student personnel problems requiring a campus-wide approach. In G.L. Saddlemier & A.L. Rentz (Eds.), Student affairs: A profession's heritage (pp. 183-191). Alexandria, Va.: American College Personnel Association.

Tollefson, A.L. (1975). New approaches to college student development. New York: Behavior Publications, Inc.

Whitely, J.M., Bertin, B.D., & Berry, B.A. (1980). Research on the development of moral reasoning of college students. In M. McBee (Ed.), New Directions for Higher Education, no. 31 (pp.35-44). San Francisco:

Jossey Bass.

Wilson, R. (1990, January 24). Boyer sees lower quality of campus life, erosion of sense of community. Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A 31-32.